

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
Chaudry et al.)	Art Unit: 2618
)	
Serial No.: 10/667,983)	Examiner: Nguyen, Tuan Hoang
)	
Filing Date: 09/22/2003)	Docket No.: 0108-0222/US
)	

Entitled: "METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR PRIORITIZING VOICE CALL
REQUESTS DURING DATA COMMUNICATION SESSIONS
WITH A MOBILE DEVICE"

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

The Applicant respectfully submits this *Pre-Appeal Brief Request For Review* in response to the Final Office Action mailed on 14 October 2008, and the subsequent Advisory Action mailed on 05 January 2009, for the above-identified patent application.

I. Summary of Disclosure. According to the present disclosure, a mobile communication device has a user interface, one or more processors coupled to the user interface, and a wireless transceiver coupled to the one or more processors and adapted to communicate via a wireless communication network. The one or more processors operate the wireless transceiver for the communication of user data for a connected data communication service for the mobile device via the wireless network. The one or more processors are further operative to receive, through the user interface during the connected data service, a voice call request for initiating a voice call from the mobile device via the wireless network. In response to the receiving of the voice call request during the connected data service, the one or more processors operate to cause a radio traffic channel between the mobile device and the wireless network which is utilized for carrying the user

data for the connected data service to be torn down, and cause the voice call to be established for the mobile device via the wireless network with use of the wireless transceiver.

II. **Claim Rejections.** In the Office Action of 14 October 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-43 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Mishra et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0087716) and Bremer et al. (U.S. Patent 7,272,215).

III. **Clear Errors In The Examiner's Rejections.** To properly establish claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. In the present case, the Examiner makes clear errors in attempting to demonstrate that the relied upon art teaches or suggests each and every limitation of the claims. The Examiner's rejections of the claims fail specifically due to any one of the following clear errors made by the Examiner, as described below:

1. **The Examiner Makes A Clear Error In Failing To Demonstrate That The Relied Upon Art Teaches Or Suggests A Mobile Communication Device Which Causes A Radio Traffic Channel Utilized For Carrying Data For The Connected Data Communication Service To Be Torn Down In Response To Receiving The Voice Call Request As Claimed.**

Claims 1-33 of the application are directed to techniques performed by a mobile device adapted to operate in a wireless network. As such, the mobile device utilizes a radio traffic channel with the wireless network for the communication of user data for a connected data session. As claimed, this mobile device receives, via its user interface, the voice call request for the voice call, and *causes the radio traffic channel which is utilized for carrying data for the connected data communication service to be torn down in response.*

The Examiner utilizes the Mishra et al. reference and the Bremer et al. reference in the rejection of claims. On one hand, the Examiner admits that the Mishra reference fails to teach or suggest the claimed action of "causing a radio traffic channel between the mobile

device and the wireless network which is utilized for carrying the user data for the connected data service to be torn down.” See e.g. page 3, paragraph 1 of the Final Office Action of 14 October 2008. On the other hand, the Examiner alleges that the Bremer reference teaches or suggests the claimed action.

Specifically, the Examiner makes reference to paragraph [0013] of Bremer to support his assertion. For example, the Examiner finalizes in the Advisory Action merely that

The Applicant should refer to Bremer reference col. 13 lines 38-47 whereas the Examiner interprets the limitation ‘the tearing down of a radio traffic channel by any mobile device.’”

Below is the passage of Bremer in full:

For example, based on calling line ID information that is passed as POTS CLASS signaling, an end user may decide to halt or significantly reduce DSL data communications to answer an incoming call from a phone number associated with a family member. However, an incoming phone call with an unknown calling line ID, which might be associated with a telemarketer, may not cause the end user to halt or diminish DSL data communications by answering the incoming POTS call.

Reading the above, the Examiner is clearly wrong. Bremer does not teach or suggest the tearing down of a radio traffic channel with a wireless network by any mobile device. What is described here in Bremer is a plain old telephone system (POTS) with Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) communications. In Bremer, DSL data communications are temporarily ceased upon detecting an open switching interval to allow on-hook CLASS signaling messages to pass over the subscriber loop. As apparent, the Bremer passage relating to the plain old telephone System (POTS) cannot possibly be reasonably characterized to utilize any radio channel with a mobile device. Even further, the Bremer passage does not teach or suggest any radio traffic channel being torn down (“halt or

significantly reduce DSL data communications” is clearly not the same as “tearing down” of any radio traffic channel) by or within any mobile communication device.

The Examiner must demonstrate that the prior art teaches or suggests each and every limitation of the claims. The failure of the Examiner to demonstrate these claim limitations at all is clear error.

2. The Examiner Makes A Clear Error In Failing To Demonstrate That The Prior Art Teaches Or Suggests A Technique Which Involves Receiving, Through A User Interface Of A Mobile Device, A Voice Call Request For Initiating A Voice Call From The Mobile Device, As Claimed.

Claims 1-33 of the present application are specifically directed to techniques performed by a mobile device adapted to operate in a wireless communication network. The mobile device utilizes a radio traffic channel with the wireless network for the communication of user data for a connected data communication session. As claimed, this mobile device is the same device that *receives, via its user interface, the voice call request for initiating a voice call from the mobile device, and performs the specifically recited acts in response to such receipt.*

The Examiner alleges that the Mishra reference teaches or suggests the recited limitations. However, the Examiner is clearly wrong. Mishra does not teach or suggest the receipt of a voice request via *a user interface of a mobile device for initiating a voice call from the mobile device* the specifically recited actions. As claimed, the voice call associated with the voice call request is initiated from, not to be answered by, the mobile device.

The Examiner refers to paragraphs [0002] and [0009] of the Mishra reference in alleging the existence of these claimed limitations. In paragraph [0002] of Mishra, it is taught that a wireless network (not a mobile station) receives incoming voice call attempts, which are subsequently rejected by the wireless network. The passage reveals that “[w]hile a mobile station is in an active packet data session, the wireless communication network may automatically reject any incoming voice call attempt to the mobile station.” Thus, it is clear that paragraph [0002] of Mishra does not teach or suggest any incoming voice call

request for initiating a voice call from a mobile device which is received at a user interface of the mobile device. There is no initiation of a voice call from a mobile device in the relied upon art.

In paragraph [0009] of Mishra, it is taught that a Mobile Switching Center (MSC) sets up a packet data session with a mobile station for data services. However, what is claimed is the receipt of a voice call request for initiating a voice call – not a data service - for the mobile device. Thus, it is clear that paragraph [0009] of Mishra does not teach or suggest any incoming voice call request for initiating a voice call from a mobile device which is received at a user interface of the mobile device.

Therefore, with respect to either paragraph [0002] or [0009] of Mishra, the Examiner is clearly wrong and this is clear error.

The Examiner must demonstrate that the prior art teaches or suggests each and every limitation of the claims. The failure of the Examiner to demonstrate these claim limitations at all is clear error.

The Applicant respectfully requests the panel of Examiners to consider the present Request and arguments with respect to the clear errors made by the Examiner, and take appropriate action based on the same. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Oskorep/

JOHN J. OSKOREP

Reg. No. 41,234

Date: 09 February 2009

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. LLC
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 USA

Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 475-1850